



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/695,794	10/24/2000	Roger S. Twede	10003591-1	3388

22879 7590 11/12/2003

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

MASTRACCI, DARYL R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 11/12/2003

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/695,794

Applicant(s)

TWEDE, ROGER S.

Examiner

Daryl Mastracci

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 October 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-18 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,901,286 issued to Danknick et al. ("Danknick").

With respect to claim 1, Danknick teaches a method for providing network access to a web server in a peripheral device, comprising the steps of: identifying a request from a client received by a host via a network to be forwarded to the web server located on the peripheral device locally coupled to the host [interpreted as Network Interface Board (NIB) of the peripheral] (Fig. 1, 7, 13A/B, 18; col. 2, lines 1-9; col. 4, lines 50-60; col. 8, lines col. 11, lines 9-39); forwarding the request to the web server [HTTP server, contained in the NIB of the peripheral device] on the peripheral device (Fig. 13A/B, 18; col. 2, lines 1-9; 32-43; col. 11, lines 24-44) and transmitting a response received from the web server to the client (Fig. 13A/B, 18; col. 11, lines 45-55). As taught by Danknick, a request is sent to the NIB of the peripheral device, which contains the HTTP server of the peripheral device, and a response to the request is returned.

Claim 6 is essentially the same as claim 1, and is rejected on the same basis.

With respect to the further limitations, Danknick teaches a processor coupled to a local interface (Fig. 1, 2, 3); a memory coupled to the local interface (Fig. 1, 2, 3; col. 5, lines 7-23); and listener logic stored on the memory and executable by the processor [interpreted as the ability to communicate (listen and respond) with another device] (Fig. 2, 3; col. 5, lines 7-57). All subsequent recitations of "logic" or "listener logic" are equated with the ability to communicate (listen and respond) with another device.

Claim 11 is essentially the same as claim 1, and is rejected on the same basis.

With respect to claim 2, Danknick teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of identifying a request received by the host to be forwarded to the web server further comprises the step of identifying a virtual socket identifier in the request that is associated with the web server (col. 8, line 64- col. 9, line 8).

Claim 7 is essentially the same as claim 2, and is rejected on the same basis.

Claim 12 is essentially the same as claim 2, and is rejected on the same basis.

With respect to claim 3, Danknick teaches the method of claim 1, and also sending an IP packet to the IP address of the device (col. 7, lines 59-61, 66- col. 8, line 6; col. 11, lines 29-36), which is equated with opening a connection to the peripheral device on a channel dedicated to the web server; and transmitting the request to the web server via the channel. Accessing an HTTP server on a device comprises establishing a dedicated connection with that server, as is known by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Claim 8 is essentially the same as claim 3, and is rejected on the same basis.

Claim 13 is essentially the same as claim 3, and is rejected on the same basis.

With respect to claim 4, Danknick teaches the method of claim 3, including sending an IP packet to the IP address of the device (col. 4, lines 14-18), which is equated with attaching a channel identifier with the request that is associated with the channel.

Claim 9 is essentially the same as claim 4, and is rejected on the same basis.

Claim 14 is essentially the same as claim 4, and is rejected on the same basis.

With respect to claim 5, Danknick teaches the method of claim 3, and communicating with a remote peripheral device (Fig. 1; col. 2, lines 1-9, 32-43; col. 4, lines 50-60), which includes receiving a response from the peripheral device (Fig. 13A/B, 18; col. 11, lines 45-55). The two-way communication of Danknick is equated with waiting for the response from the peripheral device and closing the connection to the peripheral device. Once any communication between a remote client and a peripheral device in a network is complete, the connection is terminated.

Claim 10 is essentially the same as claim 5, and is rejected on the same basis.

With respect to claim 15, Danknick teaches a method in a peripheral device to provide access to a web server in the peripheral device from a network through a host [interpreted as the NIB that enables communication between the peripheral device and a network], comprising: directing a request to the web server, the request being received from a client on the network through the host (Fig. 1; col. 11, lines 24-44); and transmitting a response to the host to be directed from the host to the client via the network (col. 11, lines 44-55).

With respect to claim 16, Danknick teaches the method of claim 15, and also directing the request through the NIB to the peripheral device. The connection between the NIB, which contains the HTTP server, and the copier (Fig. 1, 2, 3; col. 11, lines 24-44), is a dedicated connection (internal or external). The connection is a dedicated link between the network, the HTTP server, and the device and is equated with establishing a channel between the host and the peripheral device that is dedicated to the web server on the peripheral device; and directing the request received from the host via the channel to the web server.

With respect to claim 17, Danknick teaches a system in a peripheral device to provide access to a web server in the peripheral device from a network through a host, comprising: a processor coupled to a local interface (Fig. 1, 2, 3); a memory coupled to the local interface (Fig. 1, 2, 3; col. 5, lines 7-23); and peripheral listener logic stored on the memory and executable by the processor [interpreted as the ability to communicate (listen and respond) with another device] (Fig. 2, 3; col. 5, lines 7-57), the peripheral listener logic comprising: logic to direct a request to the web server, the request being received from a client on the network through the host (Fig. 1; col. 11, lines 24-44); and logic to transmit a response to the host to be directed to the client via the network (col. 11, lines 44-55).

With respect to claim 18, Danknick teaches the system of claim 17, and also directing the request through the NIB to the peripheral device. The connection between the NIB, which contains the HTTP server, and the copier (Fig. 1, 2, 3; col. 11, lines 24-44), is a dedicated connection (internal or external). The connection is a dedicated link

between the network, the HTTP server, and the device and is equated with logic to establish a channel between the host and the peripheral device that is dedicated to the web server on the peripheral device; and logic to direct the request received from the host via the channel to the web server.

Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent No. 5,323,393 issued to Barrett et al.

US Patent No. 5,699,494 issued to Colbert et al.

US Patent No. 6,092,078 issued to Adolfsson

US Patent No. 6,209,048 B1 issued to Wolff

US Patent No. 6,560,641 B1 issued to Powderly et al.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daryl Mastracci whose telephone number is (703) 305-0325. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/695,794
Art Unit: 2155

Page 7

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



DRM
November 4, 2003



HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER